



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/069,415	02/25/2002	Hongyi Zhou	CU-2844 RJS	3274

26530 7590 03/10/2006

LADAS & PARRY LLP
224 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE
SUITE 1600
CHICAGO, IL 60604

EXAMINER

AIRES, BENJAMIN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/069,415	Applicant(s) ZHOU, HONGYI	
	Examiner Benjamin A. Ailes	Art Unit 2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 18 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12.22.2005</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to correspondence filed 06 January 2006.
2. Claims 1-11 and 18-19 remain pending.

Specification

3. The disclosure had been objected to because it contained an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant's amendment to the specification filed 06 January 2006 has been entered into the record. The disclosure objection has been withdrawn.

Claim Objections

4. Applicant's amendments to claims 1, 8, and 18 filed 06 January 2006 have been entered into the record. The claim objections have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. Applicant's amendments to claims 4, 7, and 11 filed 06 January 2006 have been entered into the record. The claim rejections under 35 USC 112 have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2142

7. Claims 1 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tout (U.S. 6,182,148).

8. Regarding claim 1, Tout discloses a method of intelligent information processing in the Internet comprising:

- a) identifying whether an input is one of a URL address, English words, native language characters, and native language pronunciation notations (col. 5, lines 18-33);
- b) if the input is a regular URL, querying the input in a corresponding server through the Internet, and directly obtaining the query result therefrom (col. 3, lines 53-59 and col. 5, lines 18-33);
- c) if the input includes the native language pronunciation notations, parsing the input against at least one phonetic spelling word list to find out corresponding Internet keyword, and then fetching a corresponding query result (col. 5, lines 18-33); and
- d) if the input includes characters of a native language, processing the input as a natural language input in a natural language table, and obtaining a desired Internet keyword, and fetching a corresponding query result of website URL (col. 5, lines 18-33).

9. Regarding claim 18, Tout discloses a system of intelligent information processing in the Internet comprising:

means for inputting a query string of words (col. 5, lines 18-33);

Art Unit: 2142

means for identifying whether an input of words is one of a URL address, English words, native language characters, and native language pronunciation notations (col. 5, lines 18-33);

means for querying the input in a corresponding server through the Internet, and directly obtaining the query result therefrom if the input is a regular URL (col. 5, lines 18-33);

means for parsing the input against at least one phonetic spelling word list to find out corresponding Internet keyword, and then fetching a corresponding query result if the input includes the native language pronunciation notations (col. 5, lines 18-33); and

means for processing the input as a natural language input in a natural language table, and obtaining a desired Internet keyword, and fetching a corresponding query result of website URL if the input includes characters of a native language (col. 5, lines 18-33).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-9, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tout in view of Maruyama et al. (U.S. 5,835,924), hereinafter referred to as Maruyama.

12. Regarding claim 2, Tout discloses the method of processing native language characters and pronunciations (see col. 5, lines 18-33), but does not explicitly state the method used to perform the steps of processing, the steps being the determination of whether the notations are full phonetic spelling words or abbreviations of phonetic spelling words. However, Maruyama discloses language processing of both full and abbreviated words (see col. 7, lines 53-61 and col. 8, lines 15-31) and also the method of parsing an input string using a Chinese phonetic spelling word by using a dictionary (see col. 4, lines 34-45 and col. 7, lines 44-48). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to utilize the method disclosed by Maruyama to parse the input string using a dictionary in combination with the language processing method disclosed by Tout. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination because Tout's invention is intended to be used for many languages when handling domain queries, in this instance, one would be motivated to use the method disclosed by Maruyama in order to handle input queries submitted in Chinese (see Tout, col. 4, lines 18-30 and Maruyama, col. 1, lines 8-15).

13. Regarding claim 3, as stated above for claim 2, Tout discloses the method of processing native language characters and pronunciations in order to obtain Internet keywords (see col. 5, lines 18-33), but does not explicitly state the method used to perform the steps of processing, these steps being the method of parsing the query string against a Full Chinese Pinyin Words List and splitting the query string into one or more Chinese phonetic spelling words and using further processing methods to find

Art Unit: 2142

Internet keywords. However, Maruyama discloses language processing wherein the query is split up (col. 3, lines 38-40), and each portion is parsed using a Pinyin words list (col. 3, lines 41-52). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to utilize the method disclosed by Maruyama to parse the input string using a dictionary in combination with the language processing method disclosed by Tout. The rationale used for motivation in the combination for claim 2 applies equally as well to claim 3.

14. Regarding claim 5, Tout discloses the method of processing native language characters and pronunciations (see col. 5, lines 18-33), but does not explicitly state the method used to perform the steps of processing, the steps being the determination of whether the notations are full phonetic spelling words or abbreviations of phonetic spelling words. However, Maruyama discloses language processing of both full and abbreviated words (see col. 5, lines 53-62, col. 7, lines 53-61 and col. 8, lines 15-31) and also the method of parsing an abbreviated input string using a Chinese phonetic spelling word by using a dictionary (see col. 4, lines 34-45 and col. 7, lines 44-48). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to utilize the method disclosed by Maruyama to parse the input string using a dictionary in combination with the language processing method disclosed by Tout. The rationale used for motivation in the combination for claim 2 applies equally as well to claim 5.

15. Regarding claim 6, as stated above for claim 5, Tout discloses the method of processing native language characters and pronunciations in order to obtain Internet

keywords (see col. 5, lines 18-33), but does not explicitly state the method used to perform the steps of processing, these steps being the method of parsing the query string against a Full Chinese Pinyin Words List and splitting the query string into one or more abbreviated Chinese phonetic spelling words and using further processing methods to find Internet keywords. However, Maruyama discloses language processing wherein the query is split up (col. 3, lines 38-40), and each portion is parsed using a Pinyin words list (col. 3, lines 41-52). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to utilize the method disclosed by Maruyama to parse the input string using a dictionary in combination with the language processing method disclosed by Tout. The rationale used for motivation in the combination for claim 2 applies equally as well to claim 6.

16. Regarding claim 8, Tout discloses the use of table and the determination of Internet keywords (see col. 5, lines 18-33), but does not explicitly state the table being a natural language table and parsing the input and using the table to determine Internet keywords. However, Maruyama discloses language processing of words (see col. 7, lines 53-61 and col. 8, lines 15-31) and also the method of parsing an input string using a Chinese phonetic spelling word by using a dictionary (see col. 4, lines 34-45 and col. 7, lines 44-48). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to utilize the method disclosed by Maruyama to parse the input string using a dictionary in combination with the language processing method disclosed by Tout. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination because Tout's invention is intended to be used for many

Art Unit: 2142

languages when handling domain queries, in this instance, one would be motivated to use the method disclosed by Maruyama in order to handle input queries submitted in Chinese (see Tout, col. 4, lines 18-30 and Maruyama, col. 1, lines 8-15).

17. Regarding claim 9, as stated above for claim 8, Tout discloses the use of table and the determination of Internet keywords (see col. 5, lines 18-33), but does not explicitly state the method used to perform the steps of processing, these steps being the method of parsing the query string against a Chinese English Words List and splitting the query string into one or more Chinese words and using further processing methods to find Internet keywords. However, Maruyama discloses language processing wherein the query is split up (col. 3, lines 38-40), and each portion is parsed using an English words list (col. 3, lines 41-52). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to utilize the method disclosed by Maruyama to parse the input string using a dictionary in combination with the language processing method disclosed by Tout. The rationale used for motivation in the combination for claim 8 applies equally as well to claim 9.

18. Regarding claim 19, Tout discloses the method of processing native language characters and pronunciations (see col. 5, lines 18-33), but does not explicitly state the method used to perform the steps of performing spelling error checks and automatically providing corrections to spelling errors. However, Maruyama discloses language processing of both full and abbreviated words (see col. 7, lines 53-61 and col. 8, lines 15-31) and also the method of parsing an input string using a Chinese phonetic spelling word by using a dictionary in order to provide proper spelling of Chinese phonetically

Art Unit: 2142

spelled words (see col. 4, lines 34-45 and col. 7, lines 44-48). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to utilize the method disclosed by Maruyama to parse the input string using a dictionary in combination with the language processing method disclosed by Tout. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination because Tout's invention is intended to be used for many languages when handling domain queries, in this instance, one would be motivated to use the method disclosed by Maruyama in order to handle input queries submitted in Chinese (see Tout, col. 4, lines 18-30 and Maruyama, col. 1, lines 8-15).

19. Claims 4, 7, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tout and Maruyama in view of Bates et al. (U.S. 6,873,982), hereinafter referred to as Bates.

20. Regarding claim 4, 7, 10, 11, the combination of Tout and Maruyama disclose an environment wherein internet keywords are received in a group, but does not explicitly disclose a method for creating rules and assigning weights to keywords in order to provide a results lists that is sorted based on rules in conjunction with assigned weights. However, Bates discloses an ordering of database search results wherein the search results are ordered based on rules specifically set which sort the results based on assigned weights to the search results (col. 14, lines 6-32). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicants invention would have found it obvious to implement a sorting method for a results list based on weights assigned to keywords in a database searching routine. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to

implement the sorting function disclosed by Bates as explained above in combination with the environment provided by the combination of Tout and Maruyama because, as disclosed by Bates, it is well known and desirable when providing a search results list to be able to provide to a user ordered search results with the most relevant items provided to the user at the top of the list (see Bates, col. 2, lines 29-39).

Response to Arguments

21. Applicant's arguments filed 06 January 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

22. Applicant argues that "There is simply no teaching or section in column 5, lines 18-33 of Tout to determine whether information input to a browser is either a native language pronunciation or a name language characters" and "The Tout reference that cited by the Examiner does not mention or discuss the input of native characters or native pronunciations nor does it teach that native characters or pronunciations can be input to a computer to find a web resource."

23. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., determine whether information input to a browser is either a native language pronunciation or a name language characters" and "input of native characters or native pronunciations nor does it teach that native characters or pronunciations can be input to a computer to find a web resource") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification

Art Unit: 2142

are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

24. In the interest of compact prosecution, the Examiner would like to point out that the claim as written, specifically "(a) identifying whether an input is one of a URL address, English words, native language characters, and native language pronunciation notations" (emphasis added), requires the ability to identify at least one. Tout clearly provides the ability to identify at least a URL address in column 5, lines 18-33. Therefore, claim 1 as currently written is not deemed patentable over the prior art record.

25. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin A. Ailes whose telephone number is (571)272-3899. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4, IFP Work Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

baa

Beatriz Prieto
BEATRIZ PRIETO
PRIMARY EXAMINER